



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,856	07/22/2003	Matthew Richard McAlonis	17938 (AT 20958-02091)	6541

7590 05/31/2005

Robert Kapalka
Tyco Electronics Corporation
Suite 140
4550 New Linden Hill Road
Wilmington, DE 19808

EXAMINER

VU, HIEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/624,856	Applicant(s) MCALONIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Hien D. Vu	Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,11-17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8,10,18 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9,11,12,14-17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2833

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawing of elected species 1, fig. 1 must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Therefore, the features "first and second contact elements...common manner" in claim 1, lines 1-2 and claim 11, lines 4-5; the features "to be joined ...circuit board" in claims 2 and 12, line 3 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-17 & 19 are objected to because in claims 1 & 11, it is unclear how the first and second contact elements could configure to be joined in an electrically

Art Unit: 2833

common manner since such features are not shown in the elected species 1, fig. 1; claims 2 & 12, line 3, the feature "to be joined...circuit board" is unclear since it is not shown in fig.1.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

4. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 4, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hughes et al (130).

Insofar as the claims can be understood, Hughes, Figs. 1-3 show first and second contact elements 24, 26 configured to be joined in an electrically common manner by a member 22, the first and second contact beams 60, 48 that are oriented to project toward one another in overlapping pattern.

As to claims 4 & 14, the first and second contact pairs of contact beams oriented to project toward one another in an alternating interleaved order.

As to claims 11, an electrical socket 2, a housing 4, a plurality of contacts 6, first and second contact elements (24, 26), first and second beams (48, 60).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2833

7. Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12, 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al (130) in view of Yeh and Siedler.

As to claims 2, 5, 12, 15, Hughes does not show the base portions of the first and second contact elements being formed separate from one another and are configured to be joined to a common conductive path on a circuit board. Yeh, Figs. 1-2 show base portions of first and second contact elements 2 being formed separate from one another and are configured to be joined to a common conductive path on a circuit board (not shown). It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Hughes by forming the base portions of the first and second contact elements to be separate from one another and to be joined to a common conductive path on a circuit board, as taught by Yeh, in order to allow easier assembly.

As to claims 6, 16, to form the first and second contact beams to be deflectable into alignment in common plate would have been obvious, as show in Fig. 2 of Yeh in order to provide proper connection.

As to claims 7, 17, to form the first and second contact beams to be oriented to convey current along first and second paths and aligned in substantially parallel vertical planes would have obvious, as shown in fig. 2 of Yeh, in order to provide proper connections.

As to claims 9, 19, to provide the base portions with prongs and solders to be joined to the circuit board are old and well known in the art. However, Seilder, figs. 1-2 show base portions 16 with prongs and solder paddles 28 to join to a circuit board 12. It would have been obvious to modify the connector of Hughes in view of Yeh by providing

Art Unit: 2833

the prong with solder paddles, as taught by Seidler, in order to permanently secure the contacts to the board.

8. Claims 3 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9, 11-17 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As to the remarks of the objections of the drawing. Applicant argues that figs. 4 and 5 illustrates the contact beams are (116, 118), (166, 168) to be integrally formed with one another through end walls and a center beam and therefore they are believed to clearly illustrate and fully support the recitation of first and second contact elements configured to be joined in an electrically common manner. The examiner agrees that figs. 4 and 5 are shown such features. However, the contact elements of fig. 1 is the elected species and therefore the examiner disagrees such features are shown in fig. 1.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D. Vu at telephone number (571) 272-2016.



Vu/ds

05/20/05

HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER